



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,660	08/24/2000	Jesus Mena	L9406-002	3538

7590 01/19/2005

Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler L L P
Attn IP Department
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

LEE, PHILIP C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/645,660

Applicant(s)

MENA, JESUS

Examiner

Philip C Lee

Art Unit

2154

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address--

THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See attached paper.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 5-20.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: See attached paper


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

1. This action is responsive to the remarks filed on November 22, 2004.
2. The request for reconsideration has been entered and considered but it is not persuasive because:
 - a. Applicant argues that (1) Lazarus et al, U.S. Patent 6,134,532 (hereinafter Lazarus) fail to disclose a first data set of user information and a second data set of third party information. (2) Lazarus does not teach one or more subscriber servers for collecting information identifying a user and providing a first data set of user information. (3) Lazarus does not teach one or more demographic databases having third party information and providing a second data set. (4) Lazarus fails to teach a processor in operative communication with the one or more subscriber servers and the one or more demographic databases and receiving said first data set from the one or more subscriber servers and said second data set from the one or more demographic databases, said processor including a rule processor receiving said first data set and said second data set and applying said first and second data sets to one or more rules to determine a score predicting behavior relating to said collected information identifying said user and communicating the predictive score to the one or more subscriber servers. (5) Lazarus does not teach receiving from one or more subscriber servers user-identifying indicia and providing a first data set of user information. (6) Lazarus fails to teach generating from the user-identifying indicia a key which corresponds to values indexed by one or more demographic databases having third party information.

b. In response to point (1), Lazarus taught a first data set of user information (e.g. entity vector associated with a user's behavior and action) (col. 21, line 15-col. 22, line 22; col. 7, lines 22-27) and a second data set of third party information (e.g. user profile vector with external information) (col. 18, line 53-col. 19, line 23). In response to point (2), Lazarus taught one or more subscriber servers (Entity Vector Update Server (EVUS)) for collecting information identifying a user (e.g. user ID) and providing a first data set of user information (e.g. entity vector associated with a user's behavior and action) (col. 21, line 15-col. 22, line 22; col. 7, lines 22-27). In response to point (3), Lazarus taught one or more demographic databases (e.g. Profile Vector Update Server (PVUS)) with databases containing user characteristic information from demographic purchasing databases) having third party information (external information) and providing a second data set (e.g. user profile vectors) (col. 18, line 53-col. 19, line 23). In response to point (4), Lazarus taught a processor (Real-Time AD Server (RTAS)) in operative communication with the one or more subscriber servers and the one or more demographic databases (fig. 2) and receiving said first data set from the one or more subscriber servers (e.g. entity vector) and said second data set from the one or more demographic databases (user profile vector), said processor including a rule processor (RTAS) receiving said first data set and said second data set and applying said first and second data sets to one or more rules to determine a score predicting behavior (i.e. comparison to establish a score performed by the RTAS is specified by the session control file) relating to said collected information identifying said user (i.e. related to a unique user ID) and communicating the predictive score to the one or more subscriber servers (col. 22, lines 45-64). In response

Art Unit: 2154

to point (5), Lazarus taught receiving from one or more subscriber servers user-identifying indicia (e.g. user ID) (col. 21, lines 62-67) and providing a first data set of user information (e.g. entity vector) (col. 21, line 15-col. 22, line 23). In response to point (6), Lazarus taught generating from the user-identifying indicia a key which corresponds to values indexed by one or more demographic databases having third party information (col. 19, lines 9-24; col. 16, lines 60-65).


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100